

CY-ICER 2012

Assessment Effectiveness on the job training in Higher Education (case study: Takestan University)

Ali Mollahoseini^a * Shahrooz Farjad^b*Department of Educational Management , Takestan branch, Islamic Azad university ,Gazvin,19333-666. ,Iran**Department of Educational Management, Islamshar branch, Islamic Azad university ,Tehran, Sayad Shirazi street,19252-5656,Iran.*

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the effectiveness of training and development in the Higher Education sector using training evaluation framework. Quantitative method through questionnaire survey was used for data collection in which questionnaires were distributed to respondents in various Teachers, Staff and Managers Islamic Azad University, Takestan Branch. The findings of this study suggest that Effectiveness of training on subject were evaluated at all four levels of evaluation, namely, the reaction, learning, behavior change and results of training levels. Factors that can affect the effectiveness of training in the Takestan university include lack of support from top management and peers, employees' individual attitudes, job-related factors and also the deficiencies in training practice.

Keywords: Training and Development, evaluation, Effectiveness, Takestan

1. Introduction

Well trained workforce is essential in maintaining an organization's competitive advantage. In spite of huge investments in worker training, there is significant evidence that it produces little real impact on worker job performance. In fact, a number of researchers (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Broad & Newstrom, 1992; Ford & Weisbein, 1997) have come to the conclusion that most of the money currently spent on training is wasted, since as little as 10%-15% of what is learned in training ever finds its way to the job.

The aim of any training program is to enhance business performance. For any training program to be considered effective, trainees have to learn the training content and then apply such learning in the workplace. Training is one of the most pervasive methods for enhancing individual productivity and improving job performance in the work environment. (Goldstein and Ford 2002; Gupta and Bostrom, 2006). Evaluation of training systems, programmes or courses tends to be a demand of a social, institutional or economic nature. (Figari, 1994) Training Effectiveness is defined as a measurement of observable changes in knowledge, skills, and attitude after training has been conducted. (Bramley, 1996) Alvarez, Salas, and Garafano (2004) defined training effectiveness as the variables that are likely to influence the outcomes of the training at different stages of the training process..

Torrington and Hall (2005) stated that though training evaluation tended to be nebulous and unsatisfactory, there is still a need for organizations to demonstrate that the training conducted was of value to the organization. This was affirmed by Noe (2008) that training is increasingly being called upon to serve as the catalyst to drive change and to assists an organization achieve its stated strategic objectives.

* Corresponding Author: Ali Mollahoseini. Tel: +989122236472

E-mail address: mollahoseini17@gmail.com

The most frequently reported challenge was determining the impact of the training .(ASTD, 1997) In order to make the best use of organizational resources of time, money, materials, space, equipment, and manpower, continued efforts are needed to assess all levels of effectiveness of training programs.

However, Phillips (1991) discovered that a majority of Human Resource Development (HRD) specialists are still reluctant to evaluate the effectiveness of training programs conducted. One of the reasons is that organizations were not able to find a tool for measurement that is both parsimonious and results-oriented. There may not be a strong link between training evaluation and training effectiveness though companies that evaluate training programs are more likely to find a greater degree of effectiveness from the trainings provided by virtue of the fact that there was evaluation. This was emphasized by Grensing-Pophal (2004) that it is important to assess training effectiveness and that training effectiveness should be tied in with actual work performance.

2. Literature review

In the real world, there are some other factors that influence the effectiveness of training and development in an organization.(Haywood,1992) Tennant et al. (2002) found that immediate superior support were strongly correlated with training effectiveness.

However, to further explicate the effectiveness of training, it is critical to identify and measure the impacts of individual as well as organizational factors that affect training outcomes including learning and training transfer. (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Mathieu, Martineau, & Tannenbaum, 1993; Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992) Sackett and Mullen (1993) found that both the correlation and quasi experimental or experimental design could be used to assess the effectiveness of training program.

Holli and Calabrese (1998) defined evaluation as comparisons of an observed value or quality to a standard or criteria of comparison. Evaluation is the process of forming value judgments about the quality of programs, products, and goals. Stufflebeam (2001) defined evaluation as a study designed and conducted to assist some audience to assess an object's merit and worth. Evaluation is defined as a study designed and conducted to assist some audience to assess an object's merit and worth (Stufflebeam, 2001). Phillips (1991) defined evaluation as a systematic process to determine the worth, Value, or meaning of something. Evaluating the effectiveness of training can help identify the value of training programs, techniques to improve training programs, and the value of training resources to the organization.(Nesbitt,2004. 13)

One major model of evaluation was identified. This model, developed by Kirkpatrick in 1952, remains widely used today (ASTD, 1997). Kirkpatrick's (1996) four-level model has been the most widely cited. In this model, training effectiveness is evaluated using four criteria: trainee reaction, learning, behaviour, and business results. Most of the models in use today are modified versions of Kirkpatrick's four-level framework.(Phillips,1996; Stoel,2004)

Warr et al.(1999) examined associations between three of the four measurement levels in a modified Kirkpatrick framework and then combined the two higher Kirkpatrick measurement levels, behaviour and results, into one measurement level called job behaviour.(Reported by KayMeyer& Elliott,2003). Although newer approaches to, and models of, training evaluation have been proposed (e.g., Day, Arthur, & Gettman, 2001; Kraiger, Ford, & Salas, 1993), Kirkpatrick's (1959, 1976, 1996) four-level model of training evaluation and criteria continues to be the most popular (Salas & Canon-Bowers, 2001; Van Buren & Erskine, 2002).

3. Methodology:

3.1. Research objectives: The present research aims at studying Effectiveness of Job-Based Training in Takestan University by Kirkpatrick's Model.

3.2. Research Questions:

What is The Effectiveness of Training on four levels (Reactions, Learning, Behaviour and result) there?

What Practical Suggestions can used to improve the Training Effectiveness of The proposed Research?

3.3. Methodology:

The method employed in this study was descriptive- survey. The study aims at focusing on the nature of the training courses and their impact on the improvement of employees' and Teachers performance. The data used in the study were collected through questioners. The data is analysis done through "descriptive statistic". The statistical population consisted of (70) Employees, (50) teachers and (18) managers. The questionnaires were distributed among subjects. The questionnaires were designed on the bases of Likert (5) item scales.

4. Result:

Table (1): levels of Kirkpatrick Model

| | Level | Indicators | subject | points | Judgment Level |
|---|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1 | Reaction | 17 | Employees & Teachers | 3.68 | acceptable |
| 2 | Learning | 16 | Employees | 3.58 | almost acceptable |
| 3 | Behavior | 25 | Employees, Teachers, Managers | 3.39 | almost acceptable |
| 4 | Result | 6 | Teachers, Managers | 3.06 | almost acceptable |
| | Kirkpatrick Model | 64 | 3 Groups | 3.42 | almost acceptable |

Results show that according to Kirkpatrick Model, Reaction Level (3.68) is acceptable Level. But Learning and Behaviour levels orderly obtained 3.58 and 3.39, thus they are in almost acceptable. Also Result level (3.42) is almost acceptable.

The findings of the research indicated that the training presented, have been affected, but this effect is not very dramatic in the four levels of Kirkpatrick Model. Defining factors such as training -based job, definition training-based of performance, defined training based on organization objectives, consider the needs of individual learners, Staff awareness of the objectives of training courses, Continuity of trainings, Application of training in the workplace and proper implementation of training can directly lead to improving the effectiveness Training.

According to the results of research, training courses should be designed for each job regard to individual, vocational and organization needs. Training programs developed by the organization should be run for each person. Training should be conducted regularly and properly will lead to greater effectiveness. Finally, the effectiveness of training depends on well designing and implementation of Training, Learner Involvement, Learner Attitude change, provides opportunity to Application New skills and Knowledge in Workplace, Job Commitment, Top Managers views for Training, and connection training to Organization's Vision and Strategies.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the evaluation framework of training elements in relation to the effectiveness of training and development in the Higher Education sector. The findings revealed that on the use of a four level evaluation model for employee and Teachers training program; at level 1, most of the respondents were satisfied with the training programs. At level 2, majority of the respondents learned the skills taught. At this phase, the respondents were evaluated on their progress or behavioural changes through testing of knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired. At this stage, evaluation on the way in which knowledge was transferred is being done to ensure the effectiveness of

training. At level 3, the findings reported that the respondents use the new skills on the job. This is the measure during performance of job after training to see the usefulness of training aims, change in behaviour or approach after the training and the evaluation of training method. At level 4, the findings revealed that the training programs was productive and cost effective that is to measure change in the results of the university to ensure the progress made at organizational level. The Kirkpatrick Model was assessed as a valuable framework designed with four levels of measure to evaluate the effectiveness of training in Higher education sector.

References

- Alvarez, K., Salas, E., and Garofano, C. M. (2004). An Integrated Model of Training Evaluation and Effectiveness. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(4), 385-416.
- American Society for Training and Development.(1997).National HRD executive survey, measurement and evaluation,1997 fourth quarter survey report. Retrieved April 9, 2002, from http://www.astd.org/virtual_community/research/nhrd/nhrd_executive_survey_97me.htm
- Baldwin, T.T., & Ford, J.K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 63-105.
- Bramley, P. (1996). *Evaluating training effectiveness*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.
- Broad, M.L., & Newstrom, J.W. (1992). *Transferring training: Action-packed strategies to ensure high payoff from training investments*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Day, E. A., Arthur, W., Jr., & Gettman, D. (2001). Knowledge structures and the acquisition of a complex skill. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1022-1033.
- Haywood, K. M. (1992). Effective Training: Toward a Strategic Approach. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 33 (4), 43 - 52.
- Ford, J.R., & Weisbein, D.H. (1997). Transfer of training: An updated review and analysis. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 10 (2), 22-41.
- Figari, G., Evaluation of quality aspects of vocational training programmes.*Eur.Center Dev. Vocat. Train.*,1994,18.
- Goldstein, I.L., and Ford, J.K. 2002. *Training in Organizations: Need Assessment, Development, and Evaluation*, (fourth ed.). Wardsworth.
- Greising-Pophal, L. (2004) 'Successful Mergers', *Credit Union Management*, Dec, pp50-54.
- Gupta, S., and Bostrom, R.P. 2006. "End-User Training Methods: What We Know, Need to Know," *ACM*.
- Holli, B., & Calabrese, R. (1998), *Communication and education skills for dietetics professionals* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- KayMeyer, Mary; Elliott, Vicky. *Training Evaluation: A Review of Literature*. National Food Service Management Institute The University of Mississippi. February 2003.
- Kraiger, K., Ford, J. K., & Salas, E. (1993). Application of cognitive, skill-based, and affective theories of learning outcomes to new methods of training evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 311-328.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1959). Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Journal of the American Society of Training and Development*, 13, 3-9.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1976). Evaluation of training. In R. L. Craig (Ed.), *Training and development handbook: A guide to human resource development* (2nd ed., pp. 301-319). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1996). Invited reaction: Reaction to Holton article. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7, 23-25.
- Mathieu, J.E., Martineau, J.W., & Tannenbaum, S.I. (1993). Individual and situational influences on the development of self-efficacy: implications for training effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 125(23).
- Nesbitt .C. Jeffrey. *Development of a Systematic Process to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Environmental Health and Safety Training at XYZ Medical Center*.May 2004.
- Noe.A.Raymond.(2008). *Employee Training and Development*.Fourth Edition.Mc Graw Hill.
- Phillips, J. (1991). *Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods* (2nd ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.

Phillips, J., ROI: The search for best practices. *Train. Dev.*, 1996,50, 42–46.

Sackett, P. R., & Mullen, E. J. (1993, April). Beyond formal experimental design: Towards an expanded view of the training evaluation process.

Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471–499.

Stoel, D., The evaluation heavy weight match. *Train. Dev.*, 2004,58, 46–48.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). *Evaluation models*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Torres, R. T., Preskill, H.S., & Piontek, M.E. (1996). *Evaluation strategies for communicating and reporting*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Tennant, C., Boonkrong, M., & Roberts, P.A. (2002). The design of a training program measurement model. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 26(5), 230-241.

Tannenbaum, S. I. & Yukl, G. (1992). Training and development in work organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 43(1), 399-441.

Presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco.

Torrington, D., Hall, L. and Taylor, S. (2005) *Human Resource Management*. Harlow: Financial Times.

Van Buren, M. E., & Erskine, W. (2002). *The 2002 ASTD state of the industry report*. Alexandria, VA: American Society of Training and Development.